

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claims 8, 9, and 11. Accordingly, now amended Claim 7 is identical to Claim 11, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as written.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 13. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 13 is allowable. Thus, amended Claim 12, which has the identical limitations as original Claim 13, is also allowable. Furthermore, Claims 14, 15, 16, and 17 are also directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 12. Thus, Claims 14-17 are also allowable. Claims 18-21 are also allowable, as they are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claims 12 or 14.

Claim 22 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 31. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 31 is allowable. Thus, amended Claim 22, which has the identical limitations as original Claim 31, is also allowable. Furthermore, Claims 23-30 and 32-36 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 22. Thus, Claims 23-30 and 32-36 are also allowable.

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected on the grounds that Claim 15 had no antecedent basis for the limitation “the fixed end of the wing.” Claim 15 has now been amended so that it depends upon Claim 14, rather than Claim 12. Because Claim 14 includes an antecedent basis for the phrase “the fixed end of the wing”, Claim 15 as amended has a proper antecedent basis for the quoted phrase. Moreover, because Claim 16 depends on Claim 15, Claim 16 also includes a proper antecedent basis for the quoted phrase. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Claim 37 is new. This claim is similar to, but somewhat narrower than, allowable claim 15. Support for Claim 37 may be found at the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the specification, i.e., at the paragraph from page 3, line 36, through page 4, line 4, of the specification.

Claim 15 is directed to a structure “wherein the second member *further has* a collar.” This language implies that claim 15 can include structures having a second member and a

distinct, separate collar. New claim 37 is directed to a structure “wherein the second member *acts as a collar.*” The language of this new claim 37 implies that the second member and collar are of one piece.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. The grounds for that objection were that the drawings did not “show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” Particularly, the Examiner contended that the drawings did not show an “anchor having at least one aperture, and wherein the second member has the other of at least one resilient tab, wherein the tab releasably engages the aperture; and the second member including a second nozzle adapted to be inserted into the other of the conduits...”

In connection with this objection, the Examiner is referring to the embodiment described only in Claim 10. To overcome this objection, Applicant cancels this Claim 10, but without prejudice. Particularly, the cancellation of Claim 10 is not made for a reason related to patentability, but is instead made for a reason related to the disclosure. Hence, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Applicant traverses a related objection, i.e., that the drawings allegedly do not show “the second member including a second nozzle adapted to be inserted into the other of the conduits.” The second member 40, the second nozzle 50, and the second conduit 14 are shown in the original drawings, i.e., FIGS. 1, 2, and on the right side of FIG. 5 of the original drawings. See also description of these components of the structure of the invention, at the original specification, page 5, lines 1-3. Hence, this objection should also be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/635,966
Response to Office Action of July 29, 2004, and Amendment
Page 8 of 8

Conclusion

The remaining Claims 7, 12, 14-16, 18-30 and 32-37 are all in condition for allowance.
Action to this effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2004

By: 
Daniel N. Christus, Registration No. 29,626
Customer No. 23242
WALLENSTEIN WAGNER & ROCKEY, LTD.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312-554-3300
Attorneys for Applicant

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, IN AN
ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER
FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, ON
OCTOBER 29, 2004.


Julie M. Weisenberger